



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,692	05/15/2007	Hye Won Lee	Q96956	9037
23373	7590	07/18/2008	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			CHEN, CATHERYNE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1655	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/598,692	Applicant(s) LEE ET AL.	
	Examiner CATHERYNE CHEN	Art Unit 1655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 08 September 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/8/06, 12/19/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Currently, Claims 1-9 are pending. Claims 1-8 are examined on the merits.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I (Claims 1-8), the species fruit and yoghurt and strawberry, in the reply filed on April 25, 2008 is acknowledged.

Claim 9 is withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected group, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on April 25, 2008.

Claim Objections

Claims 2-4 are objected to because of the following informalities:

The "~" is not a proper notation. Please use a "-" line or the word "to."

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 1655

Claim 4 states that the composition further contains starch but then states that it can be present at 0 amount. This makes it unclear if starch is actually required in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 5, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bourriot et al. (FR 2811997 A1).

Bourriot et al. teaches composition for cosmetic formulation with pectin (a vegetable extract), xanthan gum, mannan at 10-50 wt% with yogurt (Abstract).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giddey et al. (US 5053219) and Clarke et al. (US 6350594 B1).

Art Unit: 1655

Giddey et al. teaches cosmetic composition containing yogurt in powder form (column 2, lines 21-22). However, it does not teach xanthan gum and mannan and their concentrations.

Clarke et al. teaches cultured plant cell gums, xanthan gum (column 4, line 23) and mannan (column 6, line 29) are used in cosmetic products (Abstract).

The references do not specifically teach combining yogurt with xanthan gum and mannan together. The references do teach that the ingredients are used in cosmetic formulation (see discussion above). As discussed in MPEP 2144.06:

It is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose.... [T]he idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art.

Thus, it would be obvious to combine yogurt with xanthan gum and mannan because they are taught in the reference to have the same purpose.

The references do not specifically teach adding the ingredients in the amounts claimed by applicant for cosmetic composition. The amount of a specific ingredient in a composition that is used for a particular purpose (the composition itself or that particular ingredient) is clearly a result effective parameter that a person of ordinary skill in the art would routinely optimize. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Thus, optimization of general conditions is a routine practice that would be obvious for a

Art Unit: 1655

person of ordinary skill in the art to employ. It would have been customary for an artisan of ordinary skill to determine the optimal amount of each ingredient to add in order to best achieve the desired results. Thus, absent some demonstration of unexpected results from the claimed parameters, this optimization of ingredient amount would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Giddey et al.* (US 5053219) and *Clarke et al.* (US 6350594 B1) as applied to claims 1-5 above, and further in view of *Breazu et al.* (RO 80928 A).

Giddey et al. teaches cosmetic composition containing yogurt in powder form (column 2, lines 21-22). However, it does not teach xanthan gum and mannan, their concentrations, strawberry and pack.

Clarke et al. teaches cultured plant cell gums, xanthan gum (column 4, line 23) and mannan (column 6, line 29) are used in cosmetic products (Abstract).

Breazu et al. teaches a cosmetic film-forming mask with strawberry juice (Abstract). A mask is intrinsically in a pack.

The references do not specifically teach combining all the ingredients together. The references do teach that the ingredients are used in cosmetic formulation (see discussion above). As discussed in MPEP 2144.06:

It is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose.... [T]he idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art.

Art Unit: 1655

Thus, it would be obvious to combine all the ingredients together because they are taught in the reference to have the same purpose.

The references do not specifically teach adding the ingredients in the amounts claimed by applicant for cosmetic composition. The amount of a specific ingredient in a composition that is used for a particular purpose (the composition itself or that particular ingredient) is clearly a result effective parameter that a person of ordinary skill in the art would routinely optimize. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Thus, optimization of general conditions is a routine practice that would be obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to employ. It would have been customary for an artisan of ordinary skill to determine the optimal amount of each ingredient to add in order to best achieve the desired results. Thus, absent some demonstration of unexpected results from the claimed parameters, this optimization of ingredient amount would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Catheryne Chen whose telephone number is 571-272-9947. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 9-5 PM.

Art Unit: 1655

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry McKelvey can be reached on 571-272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Catheryne Chen
Examiner Art Unit 1655

/Susan Coe Hoffman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1655